

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/980,347	10/22/2002	Jerzy A. Georgiades	AAT-12792	3120	
7609 75	7609 7590 07/14/2005			EXAMINER	
RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK, LLP			CHISM, BILLY D		
	VENUE, SUITE 700 OH 44115-1405		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,	,		1654		
			DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/980,347	GEORGIADES,	GEORGIADES, JERZY A.			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		B. Dell Chism	1654				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a representation of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mained patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may the ply within the statutory minimum of d will apply and will expire SIX (6) No the, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered time ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u>	<i>May 2005</i> .					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.	•				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 21-27</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8</u> is/are withdrawn Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 21-27</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.					
- 10)□	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	•	• • •	• •			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the principle application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in ority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National	l Stage			
Attachmen	• •	 □	0 (570.445)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date				
3) 🛛 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	_	f Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the species "identified by SEQ ID 1" in the reply filed on 02 May 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that it is unlawful for the examiner to restrict within a claim that gives a Markush group of which the members have a common utility and the members are of a recognized class of chemical compounds. This is not found persuasive because the MPEP §803.02 states that:

"If the members of the Markush group are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine all the members of the Markush group in the claim on the merits, even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions."

If those requirements are met then the MPEP requires the examiner to follow *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978). However, the examiner is permitted to refuse to search the Markush group if there is a lack of unity wherein the members of the Markush group do not satisfy the two-pronged requirement that the members must share a common utility **and** a common structure. *In re Harnish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300(CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Presently, the multiple amino acid sequences do not share a common structure. The lack of common structure between the many Markush members adds serious burdens to the prosecution of the application by the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-8 and 21-27 are pending. Claim 8 is withdrawn from consideration for being drawn to non-elected subject matter. Claims 1-7 and 21-27 are under consideration. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are drawn to non-elected subject matter, however, since the claims do possess the elected

Art Unit: 1654

subject matter, the claims should be amended to exclude the non-elected subject matter (i.e., all sequences that are not the elected subject matter of SEQ ID NO: 1.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-3, 4-7, 21 and 22-27 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-13 and 16-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,903,068 B1 ('068). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '068 teaches in claim 11 the instantly claimed peptide of SEQ ID NO: 1 for which the instant invention is based. Additionally, '068 teaches in claim 11 the use of the peptide for modulating immune responses in a patient and is taught as a immunological regulator administered as a dietary supplement in the claim 12 of '068, is taught as a topical in claim 13 of '068, and is taught for getting specific and general immunological responses in the claims 16-18 of '068. Thus, the peptide of claims 1-7 is taught by '068 and the method of using the peptide in the method of the instant claim 21 is anticipated by '068. It should be noted that claims 4-7 are product-by-process claims wherein the product is the instantly claimed invention and therefore is anticipated by '068.

Application/Control Number: 09/980,347

Art Unit: 1654

Claims 22-27 are obvious over '068 as further supported by the specification of '068.

Claims 11-13 and 16-18 teach the uses for the instantly claimed peptide of SEQ ID NO: 1 as an in vivo regulator for immunological activities, however, the claims of '068 do not state a carrier or the possible formulations for the peptide. However, the products of claims 22-27 are obvious in light of the specification of '068 wherein the specification teaches at column 9 lines 20-43 pharmaceutical carriers, preferred injections, and preferred orally administered formulations such as syrup, gel, liquid, pill, and capsules. Therefore, claims 22-27 are obvious.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to B. Dell Chism, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:30 AM - 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, PhD can be reached on (571) 272-0974.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/980,347

Art Unit: 1654

PATENT EXAMINER